

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 2, 4, 6 - 9, 13 - 16, 18 - 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper et al (U.S. Patent 6,192,365) in view of Chandrasekaran et al (U.S. Patent 6,738,971).

Applicants' Claims 1, 8, and 15, as previously amended require a plurality of databases of a plurality of types and said second of said plurality of databases having a different type than said first of said plurality of databases. Applicants have previously maintained that Draper does not describe or suggest databases of a plurality of types. The Examiner has also noted this in the present Office Action page 4, line 3.

Chandrasekaran notes in his column 2, lines 14 - 17, that his database system 104 may be an Oracle database server system while database system 106 may be an IBM database server system such as DB2. However, Applicants use of the term type of database is clearly defined in their Specification page 7, lines 3 - 9. Applicants list the types of databases to include a relational database, a messaging database, a sequential database, a spreadsheet database, or a Lotus Notes database. Furthermore, Applicants give on line 5 and 6, as examples of the relational database type a DB2 database or ORACLE database. Thus it is clear that under Applicants definition of the term type of database, DB2 and ORACLE are both relational type databases. These are not databases having a different type as required by Applicants' independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. Chandrasekaran therefore does not describe or suggest with his example of Oracle and DB2, this important feature of databases having a different type. Applicants Claims 1, 8, and 15 are allowable over Draper

in view of Chandrasekaran and such allowance is respectfully requested.

All of the remaining claims in the present application depend directly or indirectly on these allowable claims and are therefore also allowable.

Claims 3, 5, 10, 12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper, Chandrasekaran, and further in view of Bowen et al (U.S. Patent 6,094,649). However, this rejection is now moot in view of the arguments provided above. Withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 03/01/05

By: John Pivnichny
John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607) 429-4358
Fax: (607) 429-4119